

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11 and 14-24 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of August 18, 2009 all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1, 14-16 and 18 are amended. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

**Claim Rejections Under § 112**

In section 2, on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 14-19, 21-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Office asserts that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “each request for network resources” in the independent claims. Accordingly, the independent claims are amended to recite “a request for network resources.” Therefore, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to the claims.

**Claim Rejections Under § 103**

In section 5, on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-7, 10, 14-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Edelman et al. (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2002/0029347) in view of Circenis (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2003/0135474) and in further view of Emondi (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2002/0016748). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. The cited references, alone or in combination, at least fail to disclose or suggest appending to each request by the application a user identifier stored in the wireless terminal and the application identifier.

The Office asserts on page 2 of the Office Action that Edelman discloses that the use of the application consumes network resources. The Office refers to a daemon constantly running in the background for automatic updates to consume network resources, and that during use of the software the software periodically checks for the smart card, which is also asserted to consume network resources. However, applicant respectfully disagrees that Edelman discloses that the use of the application consumes network resources, as recited in claim 1. Instead, the

automatic updating in Edelman is with respect to the smart card data, and not use of an application. See Edelman paragraph [0098]. The daemon is used to update the smart card data in the background, but has nothing to do with use of the application. Therefore, while updating of the smart card data may consume network resources, Edelman is silent regarding use of applications consuming network resources. In Edelman software products are merely registered with a smart card, and therefore the consumption of network resources by the software products would be independent of the registering and updating of the smart card data. See Edelman paragraph [0096].

The Office further asserts that Edelman teaches appending to a request an application identifier on page 3 of the Office Action. However, Edelman only states that the client program may communicate with the registration authority, and that the registration authority is a server that maintains a licensing database. See Edelman paragraph [0067]. Therefore, Edelman does not disclose or suggest appending to a request for resources an application identifier, since the client program is merely communicating with the registration authority to verify the validity of a smart card. See Edelman paragraph [0068]. Therefore, there is no use of an application that requires consumption of network resources, and accordingly a request for network resources identifying the application that will be used, as in claim 1. Furthermore, Edelman only states that the registration information sent to the registration authority includes the unique identifier of the software to be registered. See Edelman paragraph [0080]. However, registration of software is not the equivalent of use of an application, as recited in claim 1. It is irrelevant if the registration of software involves sending a unique identifier, because the limitation of claim 1 is directed to use of network resources by the application, and requesting the network resources.

In addition, Emodi only states that due to the manner in which the tracks are stored on various platforms, the speed with which the tracks can be accessed is increased because the corresponding requests to access the tracks can be more efficiently routed to the appropriate platform. See Emodi paragraph [0026]. However, Emodi is silent regarding whether these requests include the application identifier and user identifier, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, even if it can be asserted that these requests would inherently include an application identifier, the tracks do not correspond to the application recited in claim 1, because claim 1 is amended to clarify that the application consumes network resources. While the tracks may consume storage

space on the platforms, Emodi does not disclose or suggest that the tracks consume network resources, as recited in claim 1. In addition, Emodi only states that the interface (150) enables user to communicate with the messaging platform (100) via various access devices, and a particular access device transmits data and commands via an access device protocol. See Emodi paragraph [0032]. However, Emodi is silent regarding whether the data and commands includes the application identifier and user identifier as recited in claim 1.

Independent claims 14-16 and 18 contain limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 14-16 and 18 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims rejected above ultimately depend from an independent claim, and therefore are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 15, on page 9 of the Office Action, claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Edelman in view of Circenis, and further in view of Emondi and Official Notice. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 is not disclosed or suggested at least in view of its dependency.

In section 17, on page 9 of the Office Action, claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Edelman in view of Circenis, and in further view of Emondi and Samjani, "General Packet Radio Service." The additional cited references fail to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of the references cited against claim 16 identified above. Claim 17 ultimately depends from independent claim 16, and therefore is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of its dependency.

In section 19, on page 10 of the Office Action, claims 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kunii in view of Edelman, and in further view of Circenis. Independent claims 19 and 22 are amended to contain limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, the cited references fail to

disclose or suggest the limitations of amended claims 19 and 22.

In section 27, on page 12 of the Office Action, claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kunii in view of Edelman, and in further view of Circenis, CGI and Samjani. Claim 20 ultimately depends from an independent claim, and therefore is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of its dependency.


In section 23, on page 14 of the Office Action, claims 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kunii in view of Edelman, and in further view of Circenis and Samjani, "General Packet Radio Service." Claims 21 and 24 ultimately depend from an independent claim, and therefore are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

#### Conclusion

For at least the reasons discussed above, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 19 March 2005

  
Keith R. Obert  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
Bradford Green, Building Five  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
Telephone: (203) 261-1234  
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676  
USPTO Customer No. 004955